

5.2.3 Spring Creek Preserve/Greenway

Located in southeastern Homer Township, the Spring Creek Preserve/Greenway follows Spring Creek from approximately Farrel Road to Messenger Woods north of U.S. Route 6. The preserve/greenway, part of the Forest Preserve District of Will County (FPDWC), will provide a buffer for Spring Creek against abutting development. The FPDWC is currently acquiring property along Spring Creek to support the greenway. Site development plans include the construction of wetlands and trails. Will County proposes the addition of one multi-use trail or one biking/hiking trail and one equestrian trail along Spring Creek.

5.3 Impacts on the Section 4(f) Properties

The impacts to Section 4(f) properties in the Project Corridor have not changed except for the Lustron House, Homer Township Open Space and the Spring Creek Preserve/Greenway. Following is a description of the status of the Lustron House and the Spring Creek Preserve/Greenway. For a discussion of the other Section 4(f) property impacts, refer to the [1996 FEIS, Section 5.3](#).

5.3.1 Lustron House

As indicated in the 1996 FEIS, the Preferred Alternative would have directly impacted the Lustron House just south of 135th Street. The historic structure was within the required ROW and thus would be displaced. Alternate alignments to avoid the Lustron House were evaluated and are discussed in [Sections 3.4 and 5.4 of the 1996 FEIS](#). In preparation for the construction of the Preferred Alternative, the Lustron House was razed prior to satisfying all of the stipulations included in the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) which was prepared as part of the 1996 FEIS. The MOA included a stipulation requiring ISTHA to complete an Historic American Building Survey (HABS) for the Lustron House prior to demolition. Refer to Appendix D for documentation detailing the actions taken in regards to the Lustron House and the MOA.

5.3.2 Spring Creek Preserve/Greenway

The Spring Creek Preserve/Greenway would be crossed by the Tollroad/Freeway, Enhanced Arterial and the Lemont Bypass Alternatives. The Tollroad/Freeway would pass through the Spring Creek Preserve/Greenway on ISTHA owned ROW south of Bruce Road. The Enhanced Arterial and the Lemont Bypass would pass through the Spring Creek Preserve/Greenway on Gougar Road near U.S. Route 6, requiring the purchase of additional right-of-way to the east and west sides of Gougar Road depending on the improvements made to the roadway. Since both the Enhanced Arterial and Lemont Bypass Alternatives require the widening of Gougar Road from 2 lanes to 4 lanes, a minimum of 0.45 hectares (1.10 acres) would be required within this area.

5.4 Summary of Alternate Alignments to Avoid Impacts

Alternate alignments to avoid Section 4(f) property impacts in the Project Corridor have been expanded upon since publication of the 1996 FEIS. [Refer to the 1996 FEIS, Section 5.4](#) for a detailed discussion of the alternate alignments that were evaluated other than

those presented in this Supplement. The SFEIS reviewed four additional Alternatives relative to avoidance of Section 4(f) property impacts, they included the No-Action Baseline, Mass Transit, Enhanced Arterial and the Lemont Bypass Alternatives. Even though these Alternatives did not satisfy the Purpose and Need for the action as identified in [SFEIS, Chapter 3](#), they were analyzed for comparison with the Tollroad/Freeway.

5.5 Measures to Minimize Impacts

An analysis was carried out to determine which Section 4(f) properties would be impacted for each Alternative presented in the SFEIS and in the 1996 FEIS. Tables 5-1 and 5-2 list the Alternatives and the potentially impacted areas, in addition to the Alternative's feasibility and prudence. A description of the Alternatives presented in the 1996 FEIS can be found in [1996 FEIS Chapter 3](#). At the conclusion of the analysis, it was determined that there were no feasible and prudent Alternatives to the Tollroad/Freeway.

Measures to minimize impacts to Section 4(f) properties in the Project Corridor have not changed except for the Lustron House. Note that the proposed impacts to the Section 6(f) property and the associated mitigation measures highlighted in [Section 5.5 of the 1996 FEIS](#) have not changed, and thus still apply. Following is a description of the process that has been developed to mitigate impacts to the Lustron House. For a discussion of the measures to minimize impacts to the other Section 4(f) properties, refer to [1996 FEIS, Section 5.5](#).

5.5.1 Lustron House

Avoidance of this architecturally significant structure was not found to be feasible and prudent. In consultation with the Illinois State Historic Preservation Office (ISHPO), a mitigation plan to minimize the action impacts to the structure was formulated. The structure was to be recorded according to Historic American Building Survey (HABS) standards. The structure was marketed through advertisements with a plan to move the Lustron House to a setting, which would be deemed suitable by the ISHPO. A Memorandum of Agreement ([Appendix B under Illinois Historic Preservation Agency in the 1996 FEIS](#)) was drafted in an effort to formalize this mitigation treatment and fulfill all requirements pursuant to 36 C.F.R Part 800, regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f). Since the structure was taken down prior to a HABS being done, the stipulation listed in the MOA cannot be satisfied. A coordination meeting was arranged with IHPA on August 17, 2000 to discuss the status of the coordination for the Lustron House. Conversation focused on an October 7, 1998 letter from IHPA to ISTHA in which IHPA identifies three options ISTHA could take to satisfy Stipulation 3 of the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA). ISTHA accepted Option 1: "development of a good resource file for distribution (brochure) which could be distributed to Lustron owners or the general public to promote better awareness of this historic property type" in a letter to IHPA dated August 28, 2000. It was concurred by FHWA at the August 17, 2000 meeting that if ISTHA proceeds with the above stated Option 1, Stipulation 3 of the MOA will be adequately addressed and the Section 106 process will be complete. Correspondence and meeting minutes are located in Appendix D.

12/18/00

Table 5-1 Alternatives Presented in the 1996 FEIS			
Alternative	4(f) Sites Encountered¹	Feasible	Prudent
No-Action	None	Yes	No, refer to 1996 FEIS, Section 3.2.1.
Transportation System Management (TSM)	None	Yes	No, refer to 1996 FEIS, Section 3.2.2.
Mass Transit	None	Yes	No, refer to 1996 FEIS, Section 3.2.3.
Alternative S-1	None	Yes	No, refer to 1996 FEIS, Section 3.3.1.
Alternative S-2	None	Yes	No, refer to 1996 FEIS, Section 3.3.1.
Alternative S-2A	None	Yes, Preferred Alternative	Yes, Preferred Alternative
Alternative S-3	None	Yes	No, refer to 1996 FEIS, Section 3.3.1.
Alternative M-1	Lustron House	Yes	No, refer to 1996 FEIS, Section 3.3.2.
Alternative M-2	Lustron House	Yes	No, refer to 1996 FEIS, Section 3.3.2.
Alternative M-2A	Lustron House	Yes, Preferred Alternative	Yes, Preferred Alternative
Alternative N-1	Wood Ridge Forest Preserve Black Partridge Nature Preserve Black Partridge Forest Preserve Keepataw Forest Preserve Illinois & Michigan Canal	Yes	No, refer to 1996 FEIS, Section 3.3.3.
Alternative N-2	Wood Ridge Forest Preserve Black Partridge Nature Preserve Black Partridge Forest Preserve Keepataw Forest Preserve Illinois & Michigan Canal	Yes	No, refer to 1996 FEIS, Section 3.3.3.
Alternative N-2A	Keepataw Forest Preserve Illinois & Michigan Canal	Yes, Preferred Alternative	Yes, Preferred Alternative
Alternative N-2A shifted 0.8 km (0.5 mi) east	Wood Ridge Forest Preserve Black Partridge Nature Preserve Black Partridge Forest Preserve Illinois & Michigan Canal	No, safety concerns. ²	No, refer to 1996 FEIS, Section 3.4.3.1.
Alternative N-2A shifted 2.0 km (1.25 mi) east	Wood Ridge Forest Preserve Lemont Centennial Park Illinois & Michigan Canal	No, safety concerns. ²	No, refer to 1996 FEIS, Section 3.4.3.2.
Alternative N-2A shifted 2.4 km (1.5 mi) east	Wood Ridge Forest Preserve Illinois & Michigan Canal	No, safety concerns. ²	No, refer to 1996 FEIS, Section 3.4.3.3.
Alternative N-2A shifted 0.24 km (0.15 mi) west	Keepataw Forest Preserve Centennial Trail Illinois & Michigan Canal	Yes	No, refer to 1996 FEIS, Section 3.4.4.5.
Alternative N-2A shifted 1.2 km (0.75 mi) west	Keepataw Forest Preserve Centennial Trail Illinois & Michigan Canal	Yes	No, refer to 1996 FEIS, Section 3.4.4.2.
Alternative N-2A shifted 2.4 km (1.5 mi) west	Veteran's Memorial Woods Centennial Trail Illinois & Michigan Canal	Yes	No, refer to 1996 FEIS, Section 3.4.4.3.
Move I-55 interchange east	Wood Ridge Forest Preserve Black Partridge Nature Preserve Black Partridge Forest Preserve Waterfall Glen Forest Preserve Illinois & Michigan Canal	No, safety concerns. ³	No, refer to 1996 FEIS, Section 3.4.2.

¹Section 4(f) encountered lands indicated as of publication date for the 1996 FEIS. ²Refer to [1996 FEIS, Section 3.4.3.1](#) for discussion on geometric constraints associated with an eastward shift, ³Refer to [1996 FEIS, Section 3.4.2](#) for discussion on geometric constraints associated with optional interchange locations.

Table 5-2 Alternatives Presented in this SFEIS			
Alternative	4(f) Sites Encountered	Feasible?	Prudent?
No-Action Baseline (SFEIS)	None	Yes	No, does not satisfy Purpose and Need in SFEIS Chapter 3 .
Mass Transit	None	Yes	No, does not satisfy Purpose and Need in SFEIS Chapter 3 .
Lemont Bypass	Wood Ridge Forest Preserve Black Partridge Nature Preserve Black Partridge Forest Preserve Keepataw Forest Preserve Spring Creek Preserve/Greenway Higinbotham Woods Pilcher Park Illinois & Michigan Canal	Yes	No, does not satisfy Purpose and Need in SFEIS Chapter 3 .
Enhanced Arterial	Spring Creek Preserve/Greenway Higinbotham Woods Pilcher Park	Yes	No, does not satisfy Purpose and Need in SFEIS Chapter 3 .
Tollroad/Freeway (Preferred Alternative)	Keepataw Forest Preserve Illinois & Michigan Canal	Yes, Preferred Alternative	Yes, Preferred Alternative. Refer to SFEIS Chapter 3 .

5.6 Coordination

As described in the 1996 FEIS there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of land from the Keepataw Forest Preserve and the Illinois and Michigan Canal.

Furthermore, the recommended action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the Keepataw Forest Preserve and the Illinois and Michigan Canal resulting from such use.

5.6.1 Forest Preserve District of Will County

Coordination with the Forest Preserve District of Will County (FPDWC) has continued during preparation of the SFEIS. At a meeting on June 20, 2000, the FPDWC reaffirmed their desire to maintain the proposed LAWCON replacement land as described in the SFEIS.